

09/601712

Trade Mark Attorneys Patente, Trade Marks, Designs

TOWER BUILDING, WATER STREET,

LIVERPOOL

L3 1BA

TN: 0151-238 5147 & 1417

Fax: 0151-238 2244 & 1247

E-mail: admin@roystors.co.uk

Cables: Inventions Liverpool

International Preliminary Examining Authority

Our Ref.

SMC/LF/P3997

European Patent Office

A. J. Lyons esc uma uma cra era

B. M. Cardwell poorma con con J. D. Runderson esse nese FITMA RTMA

A. R. POSTCO BY: CPA EPA

K. J. Loes esc Mar CPA FPA

F. A. Cittlerd are CPA EPA

A. J. Rewience u.s V. Christia asse

Consultants: J. S. Roberta Ness Prio CPA

Your Ref.

Erhardstrasse 27 Munchen D-80298

Date

20 March, 2000

Germany

By Fax & Post

Dear Sirs

Re:

PCT Patent Application No. PCT/GB98/02166

Video Media Control System

Danmere Limited

(P3997)

This letter is responsive to the Written Opinion and we are grateful for the extension of the response period.

A revised set of claims are enclosed against which we wish to have the International Preliminary Examination Report drawn up. The examiner's desire that we reduce the number of independent claims is noted and has received attention in the revised claims submitted herewith. In particular previous independent claim 17 has been adapted as the basis for a new claim 1 and the previous independent claim 1 revised and made dependent on new claim 1. As a consequence claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 20 have been renumbered. The wording of re-presented claim 1 has been supplemented to draw out a distinction over the prior art and stipulates that the means operable to control a video media storage device utilises conventional interfaces of an existing video recorder, e.g. signals present at the video output terminal. Yuen requires means to be incorporated into a purpose built video recorder to record information into the blanking interval or onto a control link. More particularly Yuen does not disclose means for: -

- Determining the amount of tape available for recording based on portions of the tape being selected for taping over, or
- Means for determining tape position and identifying the tape contents based on signals present on the conventional video output terminal.

Shoji does not disclose means for: -

- Determining the amount of tape available for recording based on portions of the tape being selected for taping over, or
- · Means for display of control menus including selection of material to be recorded and is therefore distinguished.

continued/...

## International Preliminary Examining Authority



Similarly, claims 21 and 22 have been redrafted as dependent claims and appear as claims 20 and 21. The features of these claims are distinguished over the likes of Morishima and Hibi by virtue of the fact that neither of these specifications disclose means for: -

• Obtaining position information by using the normal signals (video and audio) output from a video recorder/player, or

• Establishing a data sequence representative of the normal video tape content, or

• Changing the position of the video media until the desired position is found by matching a data sequence stored in memory with a sequence generated by analysing the normal video signal output from the tape player during play mode, or

Means for instigating tape positioning using said sequenced based on selection of one or more screen images.

Claim 31 has been redrafted as a dependent claim (now appearing as claim 30). Claims 32 to 36 have been renumbered accordingly, but are otherwise unchanged.

Claims 37 and 40 (now claims 36 and 39) have been retained as independent claims to reflect features which are independent of the features of claim 1. Claims 41 and 43 have been redrafted as dependent claims and appear as claims 40 and 42.

Claim 44 (now claim 43) and claim 48 (now claim 47) have also been retained as an independent claim to reflect the features which are independent of claim 1.

For the avoidance of doubt any subject matter excised from the claims as a result of the amendments is not to be considered as abandoned.

We look forward to receiving a written opinion on patentability in due course to afford an opportunity to comment more specifically on the distinctions between the prior art and the claims of the present invention before establishment of the International Preliminary Examination Report.

Yours faithfully

ROYSTONS

Enc